

**MINUTES OF THE 32<sup>ND</sup> GOA STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (GOA-SEIAA) HELD ON 20<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2016  
AT 03.00 P.M. IN THE CHAMBER OF ITS MEMBER SECRETARY, EIA-  
GOA STATE SECRETARIAT, PATTO.**

The thirty-second meeting of the Goa-SEIAA (*hereinafter referred as 'Authority'*) was held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at 03.00 p.m. in the conference room of the Goa State Pollution Control Board (Goa-PCB) under the Chairmanship of Chairman, Dr. Pramod Pathak. The list of members present during the meeting is annexed (*refer Annexure – I*).

At the outset, Chairman welcomed the members and informed about the purpose of convening the said meeting in light of the decision taken during its previous meeting (*i.e. 31<sup>st</sup>*) held on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2016 and to continue the personal hearing in respect of the following project proposal.

1. Complaint against the issuance of the environmental clearance (EC) to **M/s Sociedade de Fomento, Goa** for proposed construction of Rail Freight Terminal at Xic-Xelvona / Assolda / Chandor villages by village panchayat concerned and individuals.

All the parties concerned (*i.e. M/s Sociedade de Fomento / Village panchayat of Xic-Xelvona and Assolda / individual complainants*) were present during the said hearing along with their respective legal representatives / advocates. In addition, other local complainants represented by an advocate concerned were also allowed to participate in the proceedings. In continuation to the proceedings held during the previous meeting (*i.e. 31<sup>st</sup> on 8<sup>th</sup> July 2016*), it is informed that three major issues were raised during the discussion w.r.t. (i) Blocking of the perennial flow (ii) Cutting of the forest land in the patches and (iii) Pollution of the river and after due deliberations / interactions with the parties concerned, the proceedings were concluded with the following observation.

- A. The Panchayat representatives who insisted on the existence of a perennial stream within the area was requested to substantiate the claim of existence of perennial stream.
  1. The Project Proponent has submitted a report regarding the areas claimed as forest areas. The Panchayat people were asked to verify the report.
  2. The 3<sup>rd</sup> party (*i.e. individual complainant*) which was insisting on pollution of the river stream requested for six weeks period for studying the project to substantiate their claim. In order to facilitate complainant's assessment of the project data submitted by Project Proponent, authority directed that data of an impact assessment report and any other needed material be made available to the complainant. Accordingly the 3<sup>rd</sup> party has collected the necessary documents under RTI from this office.
  3. During the meeting, village Panchayat submitted letter from the Deputy Conservator of Forest officer reference No.1/SGF/RTI/2016-17/962 dated 08/07/2016 which mentions survey nos. 33/1-B, 32/1. As is noted, these survey numbers were within the proposed area from the map submitted by Project

Proponent earlier. Panchayat has to clarify about the ownership status of these survey numbers. Further, as mentioned in the letter No.1/SGF/RTI/2016-17/962 dated 08/07/2016, survey no. 33/1-B consists of Mango, Acacia and cashew trees and are on the barren land. In case village Panchayat Assolda has difference of opinion on this they should submit the detail by demarcating the sub-surveys pointing out that these do not fall within the project area. The Survey no.32 falls outside the area from the project.

- B. The perennial river stream locations on and the flow area should be available with the Panchayat office. Their claim for the existence of perennial stream can be verified based on the survey nos. and location of the area on the map.
- C. During the meeting the members from village Panchayat Assolda and individual residents insisted on joint site-inspection. It is to be noted that currently the monsoon is in full stream all over the State. It is not possible to make out the location of the perennial stream. A perennial stream existence can be determined based only on marking on a map in the post monsoon season when the primary runoff from direct rains and secondary runoff from percolating water ceases and the permanent stream becomes visible as marked on the map.
- D. As regards to pollution of the river stream, the party was supposed to take the EMP report, which they have not asked. Instead, two advocates were pleading on behalf of complainants. They submitted the list of documents they would like to collect directly from the project proponent. Accordingly, the Authority directed the project proponent to furnish all the documents to the complainant as requested during this meeting. Advocates pleaded to the authority to give 06 weeks time for studying and coming out with the objections. **The period can be granted provided Hon'ble NGT permits.**
- E. The project proponent has pointed out that the project will be conducted in 2-phases. During the phase-I only the green cargo will be handed. The current EC is issued for building construction of the sheds. The green cargo will consist of baggage cargo needing shade building of 10,350 sq.mts which constitutes only about 08% of the total built up area.
- F. It is to be noted that in Goa state most of the paddy fields especially on the river banks are tenanted. Usually these are the low-lying areas. These serve as run-off passages for the heavy monsoon down to ocean.
- G. These are not allowed to be filled /reclaimed converted to prevent flooding in the highland areas.

- H. Panchayat members submitted inspection report by the BDO dated 19/07/16 bearing No. 7/BDOQ//EO(RE)/2016-17/1111. It was incomplete and vague. These observed items can be verified after being marked on the map.
- I. Proponent's advocate submitted a Google map with survey numbers marked on it. It would be acceptable only after being certified for its accuracy by Town & Country Planning (TCP) as some members had alleged that the maps submitted by the Proponents were inaccurate and misleading.
- J. The project proponent will have to demarcate these low-lying areas as the complainant has pointed out and confirm whether these areas will be coming under the future expansion. If the low-lying areas are to be filled for levelling the field, then it will be violation of the state norms. The current map submitted by the proponents extends upto survey no. 5. **It does not clarify the position of the 'Y' connection for the Rail Freight handling** and the future construction for unloading the open cargo which will have to be close to the river front. So in coordination with the railway authority, which has given conceptual approval for the rail connectivity, **the proponent should prepare a comprehensive EMP report incorporating both the phases involving handling the baggage and open cargo load.** Proponent should submit the detailed layout plan as a part of EMP report for cargo handling on the river front along with jetty construction taking into consideration various apprehensions raised by the Panchayat and individual complainants as applicable.
- K. The EMP report submitted by project proponent was prepared by Accredited Environmental Consultant. Goa State Expert Appraisal Committee, which consists of experts from various disciplines, made a detailed assessment of the report, Committee, raised various queries to which project proponent replied satisfactorily time to time and the environmental clearance, was granted for the area demarcated for the construction purpose.
- L. The village Panchayat of Assolda and the individual stakeholders have many apprehensions regarding technical aspects of report submitted by project proponent. It was suggested by the Authority that they are free to undertake their own assessment by technical experts. Authority can consider for resubmission of the EMP report by complainants for reconsideration.

- M. There were certain points raised by the complainants. The consent was given for the construction activity as per the submission of the project proponent. However taking into the consideration the future activity involving Phase-II. The project proponent will have to submit a comprehensive EMP for Phase I and Phase II as a single project.
- N. Since the Village Panchayat and proponent will be exchanging the necessary documents as per the request of the villagers it is suggested that the Project Proponent should take into consideration their objections regarding land, perennial stream, pollution of the river etc while preparing the EMPs.
- O. Some complainants raised other point stating that the public hearing should be held for this project. However this proposal does not come within the purview of this authority hence authority cannot decide anything on this suggestion.
- P. One of the advocate of complainant raised doubt about manpower stationed for the construction project work. There are some aspects of the manpower discussed and clarified in the impact assessment report. In view of the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase being considered for comprehensive EIA the labour movement, their requirement of water, electricity and residential support will have to be redrawn.
- Q. One advocate of the individual complainant expressed apprehension about the demographic changes that would occur due to this project. However, this aspect is beyond the scope of authority.

Accordingly, the Authority has decided to conclude the personal hearing and submit the proceedings to project proponent as well as complainants / individual stakeholders concerned. Further, the Authority also decided to officially communicate the decision to NGT, Pune bench Secretariat in response to the 'Order' in matters before NGT, Pune bench.

Meeting concluded with a vote of thanks to the chair.

*Sd/-*  
Mr. Vivekanand L. Sawkar  
**Member, Goa-SEIAA**

*Sd/-*  
Dr. Pramod V. Pathak  
**Chairman, Goa-SEIAA**

Place: Patto, Panaji

Date: 20<sup>th</sup> July, 2016.

**ANNEXURE – 1**

**List of Members who attended the 32<sup>nd</sup> Goa-SEIAA meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2016**

- |                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| 1. Dr. Pramod P. Pathak     | Chairman |
| 2. Mr. Vivekanand L. Sawkar | Member   |